

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

MY

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 02/25/2004

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/832,078	04/10/2001	Ajit Chowdhury	780202,90075	8745
7590 02/25/2004			EXAMINER	
Bennett J. Berson Quarles & Brady LLP			LISH, PETER J	
I South Pinckn			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
P O Box 2113				1711 EK NOMBER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Advisory Action	09/832,078	CHOWDHURY ET AL.		
	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Peter J Lish	1754		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address		
THE REPLY FILED 02 January 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applice) a timely filed amendment white later (3) a timely (with appeal fee); or (3) a time	cation. A proper reply to a		
i 🛁	PLY [check either a) or b)]			
a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of this Advi event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later that ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS IN 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dath have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three more earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE e on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in a statutory period for set in a statutory p	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 36(a) and the appropriate extension fee fee. The appropriate extension fee under		
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal α	eriod set forth in of the appeal.		
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require furthe(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note be	r consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);		
	•			
(c) they are not deemed to place the application ir issues for appeal; and/or	i better form for appeal by mate	erially reducing or simplifying the		
(d) they present additional claims without cancelling NOTE:				
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti	ion(s): Clam 20, by himbe ut a	andlation		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would to canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	pe allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment		
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see continuation sheet.				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	to issues which were newly		
7. Solution For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s explanation of how the new or amended claims would be appeared to the proposed amendment (solution).	s) a) will not be entered or b) uld be rejected is provided belo	will be entered and an wor appended.		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:				
Claim(s) allowed:				
Claim(s) objected to:				
Claim(s) rejected: 1-13, 15-19, 21-25				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:				
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appro				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement	(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	·		
10. Other:		SHAW		
	MEMDACANON HEMDACANON	WINIELD STUART L. HENDRICKSON 1 LEWOLS PRIMARY EXAMINER		

Application/Control Number: 09/832,078

Art Unit: 1754

Applicant's arguments filed 1/2/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., that the incubation step results in the formation of metal chloropyromorphite) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Therefore, no difference is seen between the curing step of the Pisani reference and the incubation step of the instantly claimed invention. Furthermore, Pisani teaches the curing step in the samples treated without Portland Cement, as well as those that contain Portland Cement in the treatment material.

Additionally, the Finality of the previous office action is proper and maintained because applicant amended the claims, thus necessitating the new reference. The argument that this reference was issued by the same examiner is of no significance. Applicant's arguments imply a burden to the PTO to know in advance how applicant will amend and also incorrectly infer that only newly published art may be used in a final rejection.